



Review of Submissions:

EQUIVALENT PHYTOSANITARY TREATMENT FOR REGULATED
PESTS ASSOCIATED WITH FRESH MANGOES (*MANGIFERA
INDICA*) FROM VIETNAM

March 2014

Ministry for Primary Industries

Te Manatū Ahu Matua
Pastoral House
25 The Terrace
PO Box 2526
Wellington
New Zealand

Telephone: +64 4 894 0100
Facsimile: +64 4 894 0662
Internet: <http://www.mpi.govt.nz>

Plants, Food & Environment Directorate
Standards Branch

REVIEW OF SUBMISSIONS ON:

EQUIVALENT PHYTOSANITARY TREATMENT FOR
REGULATED PESTS ASSOCIATED WITH
FRESH MANGOES (*MANGIFERA INDICA*) FROM VIETNAM

March 2014

Approved for general release

Peter Thomson

Director Plants, Food & Environment
Ministry for Primary Industries

Contents

Page

Introduction	1
Acronyms used in the document	1
Review of submission	2
Appendix 1: Copy of submission	4

Introduction

The Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) consulted with interested parties from 21 January 2014 to 21 February 2014, on a proposed amendment to the import health standard (IHS) for fresh mangoes from Vietnam in accordance with Section 23 of the Biosecurity Act (1993) and MPI's consultation policy. The proposed amendment was to include the following equivalent phytosanitary treatment option for fruit flies associated with the commodity:

Treatment	Specification	Commodity
Vapour heat treatment	Fruit pulp temperature raised from ambient to 47°C or above for at least 20 minutes	Mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i>)

MPI received one submission on the proposed amendment to the IHS from the following stakeholder:

Kevin Nalder	Chief Executive Officer, New Zealand Fresh Produce Importers' Association (Inc.)	21 February 2014
--------------	--	------------------

This document summarizes the comments/points raised in the submission and presents MPI's responses.

Acronyms used in the document

CTO	Chief Technical Officer
dCTO	Deputy Chief Technical Officer
IHS	Import Health Standard
152.02	MPI IHS 152.02: Importation and Clearance of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables into New Zealand (http://www.biosecurity.govt.nz/files/ihs/152-02.pdf)
MARD PPD	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development Plant Protection Division (Vietnam's NPPO),
MPI	Ministry for Primary Industries (New Zealand's NPPO)
NPPO	National Plant Protection Organisation
OAP	Official assurance programme
RMP	Risk management proposal
VHT	Vapour heat treatment

Review of submission

Submitter: Kevin Nalder, Chief Executive Officer, New Zealand Fresh Produce Importers' Association (Inc.)

[Mr Nalder's submission included comments on the proposed amendment to the import health standard (IHS) for longan and lychee from Thailand. These comments will be addressed by MPI in a separate "Review of Submissions" document]

-
1. RMP for mangoes from Vietnam – on page 1 paragraphs 1 and 3, should "Tephritidae" not read "Tephritidae"?
-

MPI response:

Thank you for identifying the spelling error. The error does not affect the intent of the risk management proposal (RMP) and MPI will ensure that this error is not repeated in future documents.

2. RMP for mangoes from Vietnam – on page 1, paragraph 4, should "Plant Quarantine Division" not read "Plant Protection Division" given the acronym used is "PPD"?
-

MPI response:

Thank you for identifying this definition error. The comment does not affect the intent of the RMP and MPI will ensure that this error is not repeated in future documents.

3. RMP for mangoes from Vietnam – on page 2, paragraph 11 refers to "the development of efficacious vapour heat treatments for mangoes against *Bactrocera dorsalis* (Oriental fruit fly), *B. cucurbitae* (melon fly), *B. correcta* (guava fly) and *B. carambolae* (carambola fly)." Paragraph 13b) similarly refers to the same four fruit fly species "as representatives of fruit fly species associated with mangoes." Paragraph 13b) refers to the footnote 1 which indicates that *Bactrocera carambolae* will be included in the proposed amendment, presumably the amendment to the IHS for mangoes from Vietnam. While the efficacy of the treatment for this species is not under question, it should NOT be assumed that *Bactrocera carambolae* occurs in Vietnam (Reference: Drew & Hancock. *The Bactrocera dorsalis complex of fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae: Dacinae) in Asia. Bulletin of Entomological Research Supplement No. 2*).
-

MPI response:

MARD PPD provided MPI with information regarding the presence of *Bactrocera carambolae* in South Vietnam. Other references which confirm the fly's distribution in Vietnam include:

- i. Clarke, Anthony R. and Armstrong, Karen F. and Carmichael, Amy E. and Milne, John R. and Roderick, George K. and Yeates, David K. (2005) Invasive phytophagous pests arising through a recent tropical evolutionary radiation: The *Bactrocera dorsalis* complex of fruit flies. *Annual Review of Entomology* 50:pp. 293-319
- ii. Drew, D. 2000. Kết quả thực hiện Dự án "Quản lý ruồi hại quả ở Việt nam". Trong: Tạp chí Bảo vệ thực vật số 5, 2001, trang 178- 179. (Translation: Results of implementation of the project "Management of fruit flies in Vietnam". In: Journal of Plant Protection No. 5, pages 178-179) (AusAid project).
- iii. Hoa, N.V., Dien, L.Q. Chien, H.V., Chau, N.M., Vivaysegaran, S. Past experiences, current status and plans for the fruit fly IPM for smallholder vegetable and fruit growers in Vietnam. http://ipm.ait.asia/test/inception/IWS_DOCS/Country%20Report%20Vietnam.pdf

Bactrocera carambolae will therefore be included on the pest list for mangoes from Vietnam.

4. RMP for mangoes from Vietnam – page 3, paragraphs 13a) and 14, it is suggested that *Bactrocera tau* be removed from the list of fruit flies associated with mangoes from Vietnam (in the IHS). In White & Elson-Harris (1992), *Mangifera indica* is listed as a "?" host for *B. tau* meaning "Possible or likely host, but only known from old records; not confirmed by any known recent survey or authoritative data source." More recently, Allwood et al. (1999) in *The Raffles Bulletin of Zoology Supplement No. 7* entitled "Host plant records for fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae) in Southeast Asia", *Bactrocera tau* is not
-

recorded (from extensive field survey work involving fruit collections) from *Mangifera indica* or any other members of the Anacardiaceae.

MPI response:

It is recognised that mangoes are not a major host of *Bactrocera tau* (Plant Health Australia 2011, The Australian handbook for the identification of fruit fly V1.0). However, a number of references and risk analyses recognise mangoes as a minor host of *Bactrocera tau*. These include:

- i. DAFF (2008) Final Import Risk Analysis Report for Fresh Mango Fruit from India.
- ii. USDA (2006) Importation of fresh mango fruit (*Mangifera indica* L.) from Vietnam into the Continental United States. A qualitative, pathway-initiated pest risk assessment.
- iii. CABI (2014) *Crop Protection Compendium, 2014 Edition*. CAB International, Wallingford, UK. Online version: <http://www.cabi.org/compendia/cpc/> [accessed 2014]
- iv. Mahfuza K, Tahira BR, Howlader J (2011). Comparative Host Susceptibility, Oviposition, and Colour Preference of Two Polyphagous Tephritids: *Bactrocera cucurbitae* (Coq.) and *Bactrocera tau* (Walker). *Research Journal of Agriculture and Biological Sciences*, 7 (3): 343-349.
- v. Peña, J.E. and Mohyuddin, A.I. (1997). Insect pests. In: Litz, R.E. (ed.). *The Mango: Botany, Production and Uses*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International, pp. 327-362
- vi. Plantwise knowledge bank (accessed February 2014)
<http://www.plantwise.org/KnowledgeBank/Datasheet.aspx?dsid=8741>.

Bactrocera tau will therefore be retained on the pest list for mangoes from Vietnam.

Appendix 1: Copy of submission

Submission from: Kevin Nalder, Chief Executive Officer, New Zealand Fresh Produce Importers' Association (Inc.)

21 February 2014

Plant Imports
Import & Export Standards
Ministry for Primary Industries
PO Box 2526
WELLINGTON 6140

To whom it may concern

Risk Management Proposal: Equivalent phytosanitary treatment for regulated pests associated with fresh mangoes (*Mangifera indica*)

Risk Management Proposal: (Equivalence proposal) Irradiation of fresh *Litchi chinensis* (lychee) and *Dimocarpus longan* (longan) for human consumption from Thailand to New Zealand

On behalf of the New Zealand Fresh Produce Importers' Association (NZ FPIA) I wish to thank the Ministry for the opportunity to comment on the Risk Management Proposals for mangoes from Vietnam, and lychee and longan from Thailand, both dated January 2014.

I wish to convey that in general, NZ FPIA does not take issue with the two Risk Management Proposals (RMPs). However, NZ FPIA does seek clarification on some of the details provided in the RMPs and requests that some points be given consideration when finalising amendments to the IHSs. Specifically, NZFPIA makes the following comments:

1. RMP for mangoes from Vietnam – on page 1 paragraphs 1 and 3, should “Tephritidae” not read “Tephritidae”?
2. RMP for mangoes from Vietnam – on page 1, paragraph 4, should “Plant Quarantine Division” not read “Plant Protection Division” given the acronym used is “PPD”?
3. RMP for mangoes from Vietnam – on page 2, paragraph 11 refers to “the development of efficacious vapour heat treatments for mangoes against *Bactrocera dorsalis* (Oriental fruit fly), *B. cucurbitae* (melon fly), *B. correcta* (guava fly) and *B. carambolae* (carambola fly).” Paragraph 13b) similarly refers to the same four fruit fly species “as representatives of fruit fly species associated with mangoes.” Paragraph 13b) refers to the footnote 1 which indicates that *Bactrocera carambolae* will be included in the proposed amendment, presumably the amendment to the HIS for mangoes from Vietnam. While the efficacy of the treatment for this species is not under question, it should NOT be assumed that *Bactrocera carambolae* occurs in Vietnam (Reference: Drew & Hancock. The *Bactrocera dorsalis* complex of fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae: Dacinae) in Asia. Bulletin of Entomological Research Supplement No. 2).
4. RMP for mangoes from Vietnam – page 3, paragraphs 13a) and 14, it is suggested that *Bactrocera tau* be removed from the list of fruit flies associated with mangoes from Vietnam (in the IHS). In White & Elson-Harris (1992), *Mangifera indica* is listed as a “?” host for *B. tau* meaning “Possible or likely host, but only known from old records;

not confirmed by any known recent survey or authoritative data source.” More recently, Allwood *et al.* (1999) in The Raffles Bulletin of Zoology Supplement No. 7 entitled “Host plant records for fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae) in Southeast Asia”, *Bactrocera tau* is not recorded (from extensive field survey work involving fruit collections) from *Mangifera indica* or any other members of the Anacardiaceae.

5. RMP for lychee and longan from Thailand – page 5, paragraph 22, Table 5, row 5 (including heading row) column 3, amend to read “Resort and resubmit for phytosanitary inspection. If nil detections, then irradiate at a minimum absorbed dose of 250 Gy OR Irradiate at a minimum absorbed dose of 400Gy”.
6. RMP for lychee and longan from Thailand – page 5, paragraph 23. Is paragraph 23 consistent with paragraph 21 (on page 4) which refers to Acarina juvenile lifestages?
7. RMP for lychee and longan from Thailand – page 12 Appendix 1, it is suggested that *Bactrocera cucurbitae* be removed from the list of fruit flies associated with lychee from Thailand (in the IHS). Allwood *et al.* (1999) in The Raffles Bulletin of Zoology Supplement No. 7 entitled “Host plant records for fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae) in Southeast Asia”, only records *Bactrocera dorsalis* (from extensive field survey work involving fruit collections) from *Litchi chinensis*.
8. RMP for lychee and longan from Thailand – page 17 Appendix 3. This proposed amendment of IHS regulated pest lists is commended. However, an additional amendment should be considered (refer point 5 above).

The NZ FPIA also notes that an important consideration of the RMPs includes the recognition of existing treatments for non-tested species where there is a body of supporting evidence for related species. The NZ FPIA strongly supports this approach and looks forward to similar considerations in the future.

The NZ FPIA members look forward to the issuance of the revised IHSs and hopes that comments 3, 4, 5 and 7 above are taken into consideration as they are finalised.

Regards

Yours sincerely

Kevin Nalder
Chief Executive Officer
New Zealand Fresh Produce Importers’ Association (Inc.)